

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 66-91 are pending in this application.

Claims 66-68, 76-78, 86, 87, 89, and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldering et al. U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0026638 (hereinafter "Eldering") in view of the "IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin" (hereinafter "IBM Bulletin"), in further view of Matthews, III U.S. Patent No. 5,815,145 (hereinafter "Matthews I"), and in further view of Matthews, III et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 (hereinafter "Matthews II").

Claims 69-71, 79-81, 88, and 91 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldering, in view of the IBM Bulletin, in further view of Matthews I, in further view of Matthews II, and in further view of Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,585,838 (hereinafter "Lawler").

Claims 72-75 and 82-85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldering, in view of the IBM Bulletin, in further view of Matthews I, in further view of Matthews II, and in further view of Goldschmidt Iki et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,295,645 (hereinafter "Goldschmidt").

The rejections of claims 66-91 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully traversed.

II. The Combination of Eldering, the IBM Bulletin,
Matthews I, and Matthews II Fail to Show or
Suggest All of Applicants' Claimed Features

Independent claims 66 and 76 are directed to a method and system for using an interactive application on a display screen to access content. At least two cells are provided on the display screen. Each of the at least two cells is operable to be associated with a television channel and to display, within the cell, video content being broadcast on the television channel. An indicator is displayed that notifies the user of the availability of interactive content associated with the television channel associated with the cell. The at least two cells are grouped into a region, and a region highlight is displayed that surrounds the cells in the region. A user is allowed to navigate the region highlight, wherein no cell highlight appears on the display while the user is navigating the region highlight. In response to a user selection of a region surrounded by the region highlight, a cell highlight is displayed around a cell in the selected region. The user is then allowed to navigate the cell highlight to each of the cells in the selected region, wherein only the cell that is surrounded by the cell highlight is in focus. Finally, the user is allowed to access the interactive content associated with the television channel for a cell for which an indicator is displayed and which is in focus.

The Examiner contends that the combination of Eldering, the IBM Bulletin, Matthews I, and Matthews II shows all of applicants' claimed features recited in independent claims 66 and 76. (See Office Action, pages 4-10). Applicants respectfully disagree. Although the IBM Bulletin refers to a border around the frame of a web page, and Matthews I shows cursor 108 around programming tile 102a (see Mathews I, FIG. 4), none of the references, alone or in combination, shows or suggests displaying a cell highlight around a cell in the selected region in response to a user selection of the region surrounded by the region highlight, as recited by applicants' independent claims.


For example, a user of applicants' claimed invention may navigate between regions using a region highlight. While navigating between regions using the region highlight, no cell highlight appears on the display. Then, in response to a user selection of a highlighted region, a cell highlight is displayed around a cell in the selected region. The user may then navigate the cell highlight to other cells within the selected region. The Office Action, in combining the four references in a piecemeal fashion, has overlooked the claimed functionality of displaying a cell highlight around a cell in a selected region in response to a user selection of that region.

For at least the foregoing reason, applicants submit that independent claims 66 and 76 are allowable over Eldering, Matthews I, Matthews II, and the IBM Bulletin. Dependent claims 67-75 and 77-91, each of which includes all the limitations of its respective independent claim, are allowable for at least the same reason. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 66-91 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Mack
Reg. No. 57,189
Agent for Applicants
Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000